

REMARKS

Claims 28-30, 32-37 and 39-43 are pending in the present application. Claims 28-30, 32-37 and 39-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a).

The Examiner has rejected Claims 28 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,259,774 (Miloslavsky) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,332,154 (Beck et al.). In light of the arguments made below the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As disclosed in both Claims 28 and 36, the Applicant's invention teaches an automated customer system and method whereby system users may be put in communication with a customer service agent. One feature taught in particular, is a capability for a system user to program into the system a selected time to receive a call back from a customer service representative.

The Examiner notes in the rejection that both the cited references teach this feature. The Examiner further refers to sections of both the Miloslavsky and Beck et al. patents which include descriptions of this feature. The Applicant respectfully disagrees that these references describe this feature.

As was noted previously, in Column 9, Lines 50-57 of Miloslavsky there is discussion as to the creation of a telephone queue in which callbacks are placed to system users on a first in first out manner. It further states that other priority schemes are possible, however it does not suggest that a system user, through a presented user interface, may enter a time whereby the system may schedule a call back. The Examiner further notes Column 10, Lines 10-17 of Miloslavsky which teaches that certain messages may be provided to a system user as to the wait time before a customer service representative may be reached and it also mentions that the system user has the freedom to request a rescheduling of the call. What this section does not teach or suggest is that this rescheduling of the

call is an automated process whereby the callback display is presented including a plurality of modes of communication which are selectable as well as a preferred time for the callback. Further it does not teach that the system may further access this preferred time for callback and automatically schedule this callback with an identified service agent.

With regards to the Beck et al. reference, the Examiner notes that this reference teaches a callback display configured so that the system user may select the plurality of modes of communication for a callback as well as a preferred time. The Examiner notes in particular that the Abstract, Column 4, Lines 25-37, Column 14, Lines 18-27 and Figs. 5, 9 and 20 teach this feature. In the Abstract, it is taught that information related to a client transaction history may be stored and that the system may establish contact with a client through provided information. What this portion of the patent does not teach or suggest is that a system user may enter this information through a provided display and that the callback is then automatically rescheduled based on the system user's selected time.

In Column 4, Lines 25-37 of Beck et al. it is taught that one or the system user may present one or more web pages to the system with more information. These pages may include banner links, on-line uniforms, frequently asked questions (FAQ) list, product presentation interactive (PPI) and so on. What is not taught or suggested in this portion is a display whereby scheduling information for a callback may be entered and that the system is further configured to automatically schedule the callback. With regards to Column 14, Lines 18-27 of Beck et al. this portion teaches the routing of an incoming call to a particular agent based on retrieved customer information as well as transferring to a IVR for automatic processing. This reference does not teach the automated scheduling functions which are disclosed in the Applicant's invention.

With regards to the references to the Figures, the Applicant cannot find anything which relates to the inputting and automated scheduling of callbacks to a system user. This reference does teach a number of screen displays and interactive devices which can be used in an automated customer service system, however it does not teach the type of scheduling functions which are taught in the Applicant's invention. As such the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. section 103(a) is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has further rejected Claims 30, 29, 32-35, 37 and 39-43 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined system of Miloslavsky and Beck et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,848,143 (Andrews et al.). Because all of the noted claims are dependent, that is they all depend on either Claim 28 or 36, the Applicant's reasons for patentability are equally applicable to the dependent claims noted by the Examiner. As such, the Examiner's rejection is again respectfully traversed.

Based upon the foregoing, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP

By: 

Kenneth J. Johnson, Esq.

Registration No. 36,834

3151 South Vaughn Way, Suite 411

Aurora, Colorado 80014

Telephone: (303) 338-0997

Facsimile: (303) 338-1514

Date: January 12, 2004